

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/563,457	OAKLEY, WILLIAM S.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	MARK FISCHER	2627	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mark Fischer (Examiner).

(3) Glenn E. Von Tersch (Attorney).

(2) Hoa Nguyen (SPE).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 08 October 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 6, 22-24.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.


(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Attorney proposed to cancel claims 1-11 and add new independent claims 22-24. However, newly proposed claims include the limitation of an e-beam which was not present in the original claims. It was suggested to the Attorney that the inclusion of the e-beam would require a new search by the Examiner and would also lead to a non-responsive action. SPE suggested that the Attorney may need to file a continuation in order to have claims 22-24 examined. The Attorney also proposed a possible amendment to independent claim 6 to include limitations of deflection of the e-beam for tracking. However, the new matter added to claim 6 would result in a final action.

MF

  
HOA T. NGUYEN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700  
10/8/08